

## REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed February 12, 2007, the Examiner took the following action: (1) objected to the numbering of the claims due to informalities; and (2) rejected claims 1-37 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith (U.S. 5544842) in view of Fad (U.S. 5793632) and further in view of McGuire (U.S. 4404639).

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

### *I. Claim Objections*

The Examiner objected to the mis-numbering of second claim 36. Applicants have renumbered the second claim 36 to be claim 37. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection.

### *II. Rejections Under §103(a)*

The Examiner rejected all of claims 1-37 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith (U.S. 5544842) in view of Fad (U.S. 5793632) and further in view of McGuire (U.S. 4404639).

As amended, claim 1 recites:

1. A method for estimating man-hours and costs to complete a certification of a modification to a system, the method comprising:
  - entering one or more components that require certification activity based on the modification;
  - based on the entered one or more components, automatically identifying other components that require certification activity based on the entered one or more components, *at least some of the identified other components being only indirectly related to the modification*;
  - identifying scope of work needed to complete certification for each of the entered and identified components;
  - determining if the entered and identified components and the associated scopes of work apply to the modification; and
  - generating an estimate of man-hours and costs needed to complete certification based on all of the determined scopes of work. (emphasis added).

Smith (U.S. 5544842)

Smith teaches apparatus and methods for conversion of a three pilot aircraft cockpit to a two pilot aircraft cockpit. (3:43-49). According to Smith, a supplemental type certification can be granted by the FAA for the resulting aircraft. (4:18-20). As noted by the Examiner, Smith is silent as to all other aspects of the method taught by Applicants and recited in claim 1. (Office Action, p. 3).

Fad (U.S. 5793632)

Fad teaches tools for estimating costs and labor associated with designing and producing products, including avionics and space system costs. (1:15-20; 3:14-22). According to Fad, a parametric model provides pertinent financial information to perform estimates including labor and materials. (3:36-49).

McGuire (U.S. 4404639)

McGuire teaches a system and method for diagnosis and servicing of an automobile. (2:28-34). According to McGuire, a system will provide a user with specifications for a vehicle, the present condition of the vehicle, the recommended service to improve the vehicle performance, and the service history. (2:28-34). In the portion of McGuire referenced by the Examiner, McGuire teaches that the system may provide “a listing of parts associated with the tune-up of that vehicle and an index or menu of other available visual data that may be accessed for that vehicle.” (11:62-65).

Applicants respectfully submit that the Cited References (Smith, Fad, and McGuire), either singly or in any properly motivated combination, fail to disclose, teach, or fairly suggest the method recited in claim 1. Specifically, the Cited References fail to teach or suggest a method that includes, based on one or more entered components, “automatically identifying other components that require certification activity based on

the entered one or more components, *at least some of the identified other components being only indirectly related to the modification.*” The Examiner admits that neither Smith or Fad teach or suggest this limitation, and references McGuire for such teachings.

Applicants respectfully submit that McGuire fails to teach or fairly suggest the above-noted limitation of “automatically identifying other components that require certification activity based on the entered one or more components, *at least some of the identified other components being only indirectly related to the modification*” as recited in claim 1. McGuire teaches a system that identifies all of the components involved in an engine tune up. (11:62-65). There is, however, no teaching or suggestion in McGuire or identifying other components that are only indirectly related to the tune up, as disclosed by Applicants and as recited in claim 1.

For example, McGuire only teaches the components associated with the tune up, and does not identify anything that is only indirectly related, such as, hypothetically speaking, a component in the transmission, drive train, or interior of the vehicle. Although such a hypothetical is admittedly a remote possibility, if the tune up increased the horsepower of the vehicle’s engine, McGuire would not take into account and list the other possible components that might be impacted, such as the drive train, U bolts holding the drive axel to the frame, etc. On the other hand, methods as taught by Applicants take into account components directly effected by the modification, and also other possible components only indirectly related.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is allowable over the Cited References. The other independent claims of the application (claims 10, 19, and 28) have been amended to recite substantially the same limitations as discussed above with respect to claim 1, and therefore, by analogous reasoning, such other independent claims are also allowable over the Cited References. Of course, all dependent claims depending from such independent claims are also allowable at least due to their dependencies on the independent claims. Accordingly, claims 1-37 are allowable

over the Cited References.

Dependent Claims 2, 11, 20. and 29

Furthermore, as amended, dependent claim 2 recites:

2. The method of Claim 1, wherein each scope of work comprises one or more methods of compliance to be performed in order to satisfy one or more government regulations associated with the component, and *wherein the estimate includes estimated man-hours and costs for performing the one or more methods of compliance.* (emphasis added).

These additional limitations are also not taught or fairly suggested by the Cited References. Although Smith describes a method of converting a three-pilot aircraft to a two-pilot aircraft, and mentions that such a two-pilot aircraft may be certified by the FAA under a supplemental type certification (4:17-20), there is no teaching or suggestion in Smith or any of the other Cited References of estimating the man-hours and cost associated with performing such certifications. The cost estimating tools taught by Fad are likewise silent as to the necessity or desirability of estimating a method of compliance with a government regulation, as are the systems of McGuire. Thus, the Cited References also fail to teach or fairly suggest these additional limitations.

*III. Petition for Extension of Time and  
Authorization to Withdraw from Deposit Account*

Applicants herewith petition the Commissioner of Patents under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(3) for a <sup>one (1) month</sup> two-month extension of time for filing this response. Authorization is hereby granted to withdraw the necessary fees for this extension of time from Deposit Account No. 12-0769, to which any overpayments may be credited and any deficiencies may be charged.

### CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-37 are now in condition for allowance. If there are any remaining matters that may be handled by telephone conference, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: June 12, 2007

By: Dale C. Barr  
Dale C. Barr  
Lee & Hayes, PLLC  
Reg. No. 40498  
206-315-7916